

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-15 are now present in the application. The specification, abstract, title and claims 1, 3-8 and 10-15 have been amended. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification, title and abstract have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is entered. Entry of the above amendments to the specification, title and abstract is earnestly solicited.

A Substitute Specification is attached hereto. This statement is included in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125 to indicate that it is the undersigned's belief that no new matter has been included in the Substitute Specification and Abstract.

A comparison version of the specification is provided. This comparison document indicates all additions and deletions to the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the Substitute Specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the comparison document which compares the originally filed specification to the amended specification or Substitute Specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pellegrino, U.S. Patent No. 6,149,441. Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellegrino in view of Rothenberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,828. Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellegrino in view of McKelvie, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0217096. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended incorporate the subject matter of claims 2 and 9, respectively.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites “an achievement-checking module, connecting with said remote communication module for comparing speech waveforms of said user’s speech to waveforms of correspondent speech data in said database so as to provide an achievement result of learning.” Independent claim 8 now recites “checking user’s learning, comprising: receiving audio signal of said user’s speech; comparing audio signals of said speech with correspondent data from said database; and generating a comparison result.” Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 8 are not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The present invention on page 2, lines 1-13 discloses as follows:

As computer and multimedia technologies being developed, people try to use computer for helping their language learning. Some real-time and interactive communication are made. However, most training media are just of real voice dialogue plays. Some online speech learning are users taking free talks without certain topics. Because of the free talks, the achievement of learning cannot be measured. For learning a language, some major fields such as work, life or entertainment, can be specified; further some detailed scenes, such as talking on trades or talking for interview or others, can be provided. When online participants take only free talks, they don't have a distinct topic to practice and cannot get an effective learning. Therefore, it is a demand to apply computer network technology to language-learning that the users not only practice on specific topics but also enjoy online interactive speech learning. The ideal learning system provides online conversation and achievement measurements so that the users can notice their insufficiency and take effective practices.

Pellegrino simply belongs to such conventional art of educational system because Pellegrino does not teach any online interactive speech learning. Although Rothenberg discloses a speech recognition apparatus and method for learning, the techniques of "online speech learning" (Pellegrino) and "speech recognition method for learning" (Rothenberg) are developed for years. However, no one skilled in the art had considered using the speech recognition in online speech learning for achieve online interactive speech learning to simulate a remote companion speech learning before the present invention was made, which suggests that one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to modify Pellegrino in view of Rothenberg.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on McKelvie, this reference also fails to disclose the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Pellegrino.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 8 or their

dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/806,091
Amendment dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2007

Docket No.: 3313-1139PUS1

Page **13 of 13**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

for BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP *#43,368*

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments:

A Clean Copy of the Substitute Specification

A Marked-up Copy of the Substitute Specification

